

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/591,788	VINOGRADOVA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Matthew O. Savage	1797	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Matthew O. Savage.

(2) Michael Fainberg.

**Date of Interview:** 14 October 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*1-4*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Hofmann et al, Edwards et al*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend claim 1 to patently distinguish over Hofmann et al and Edwards et al, the added claim language having basis in FIG. 2, the second and third full paragraphs on page 4 of the specification, and the paragraph at the bottom of page 6 of the specification. Agreed to amend claims 2 and 4 to correspond to changes made to claim 1. Agreed to amend the specification so as to correspond with the claims. See the attached examiner's amendment for details.